

The Honorable Deborah A. Batts United States District Judge Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 2510 New York, NY 10007



FDIC v. The McGraw Hill Cos., Inc., No. 10-cv-4421-DAB

Dear Judge Batts:

We represent Fitch, Inc., one of the defendants in the above-captioned action. We respectfully write this letter on behalf of all of the defendants in order to seek clarification concerning a procedural matter. Specifically, we request Your Honor's guidance on how the Court wishes to treat the defendants' motions to dismiss this action, which were fully briefed and filed in the Commercial Division of Supreme Court New York County (the "Commercial Division"), where this action was originally commenced prior to its removal from state court.

This action was filed by plaintiff, Riverside National Bank of Florida ("Riverside") in the Commercial Division on November 13, 2009 to recover financial losses that it claims it incurred as a result of its alleged purchase of more than twenty collateralized debt obligations ("CDOs") between 2005 and 2007. The complaint lists seven causes of action, including common law fraud, negligent misrepresentation and

According to the complaint (at ¶ 1), a CDO is "a structured finance product where the investors' interest and principal payments are secured by a basket of securities issued by either banks, thrifts, insurance companies, real estate investment trusts or a combination of the same."

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

The Honorable Deborah A. Batts

2

breach of fiduciary duty. The case was assigned to Justice Charles Ramos of the Commercial Division on November 19, 2009. On December 11, 2009, the defendants filed motions to dismiss with separate briefs on behalf of the following three groups of defendants: (1) the asset managers who managed some of the CDOs' underlying collateral (the "Collateral Manager Defendants"), (2) the investment banks who allegedly marketed and sold the CDOs (the "Seller Defendants"), and (3) the credit rating agencies who allegedly provided credit ratings opinions with respect to the CDOs (the "Rating Agency Defendants"). Briefing on these motions to dismiss continued through April 1, 2010. After briefing on the motions to dismiss was complete, Justice Ramos scheduled oral argument to take place on May 12, 2010.

Approximately one month before the scheduled oral argument, however, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") was appointed as the Receiver for Riverside on April 16, 2010. On May 4, 2010, the FDIC filed an unopposed motion seeking (a) to be substituted for Riverside as the plaintiff in this action, and (b) a 90-day stay of the proceedings pursuant to 12 U.S.C. § 1821(d)(12)(A)(ii). On May 18, 2010, Justice Ramos granted the substitution motion and ordered the 90-day stay. In light of the substitution of the FDIC as the plaintiff, the defendants removed this action to the Southern District of New York on June 3, 2010 pursuant to 12 U.S.C. § 1819(b)(2)(A) and 28 U.S.C. § 1446.

In light of the above, it had been defendants' understanding and assumption that pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 81(c)(2), the fully-briefed motions to dismiss filed in the Commercial Division with the motions to dismiss are now properly pending before this Court. Cf. Frank B. Hall & Co. v. Rushmore Ins. Co., 92 F.R.D. 743, 745 (S.D.N.Y. 1981). Nonetheless, in three related orders filed on June 16, 2010 (copies attached), Justice Ramos deemed the defendants' motions to dismiss "withdrawn without prejudice." Although filed on June 16, the orders are dated June 2, 2010, one day before the defendants removed this action to this Court. Accordingly, defendants respectfully seek the Court's guidance as to whether Your Honor views the motions to dismiss as currently pending before this Court, whether Your Honor would instead prefer that the defendants re-file the relevant moving papers following the expiration of the stay, or whether the Court would instead like to handle this issue in another manner.

The three Collateral Manager Defendants are Trapeza Capital Management, LLC; Taberna Capital Management, LLC; and Cohen & Company Financial Management, LLC.

The ten Seller Defendants are FTN Financial Capital Markets; Keefe Bruyette & Woods, Inc.; Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.; ABN Amro, Inc.; Cohen & Company; Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.; Credit Suisse Securities (USA), LLC; SunTrust Robinson Humphrey, Inc.; and JPMorgan Securities Inc. Pursuant to a stipulation executed and filed on December 10, 2009, defendant JP Morgan Chase & Co. was dismissed from this action without prejudice.

The three Rating Agency Defendants are Fitch Ratings, Inc.; Standard & Poor's, a unit of McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.; and Moody's Investor Services, Inc.

Attached as Exhibit A to this letter is a full list of all the pleadings submitted in connection with the motions to dismiss.

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

The Honorable Deborah A. Batts

3

Of course, we are happy to respond to any questions the Court may have or provide any additional information that the Court may require.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta A. Kaplan, Esq.

MEMO ENDORSED

cc: Joel P. Laitman, Esq.
Christopher Lometti, Esq.
Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll, PLLC
150 East 52nd Street, 30th floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 838-7797

Floyd Abrams, Esq. Adam Zurofsky, Esq. Cahill Gordon & Reindell LLP 80 Pine Street New York, New York 10005 (212) 701-3000

Joshua M. Rubins, Esq.
James J. Coster, Esq.
Satterlee Stephens Burke & Burke LLP
230 Park Avenue, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10169
(212) 818-9200

Edward A. Friedman, Esq. Robert J. Lack, Esq. Friedman Kaplan Seiler & Adelman LLP 1633 Broadway New York, New York 10019 (212) 833-1100 Defendants to refile
Motions to Dismiss within
Go days, Plaintiff's
opposition due GO
days thereafter, reply
due 30 days after
opposition is filed.
All papers are to conform
with the applicable rules
of this Court MAB/
SO ORDERED DORS OG/25/10

Deborah a. Batte